

DIFFERENCE AND DIFFERENTIATION

BRONWYN DAVIES

In the Introduction I sketched out the ways in which neoliberal managerialism has generated pedagogies that are closed and end-product driven and that heighten individualism and competition *against* the other. I suggested an alternative form of pedagogy that was relational and involved an ongoing art of becoming. I did not set these in binary opposition to each other but as able to exist in the same place, working together in unexpected ways. The most important conceptual shift that Deleuze offers us for re-thinking the ways in which we might open up the territorialized and over-coded striations of schooling is the move from difference to differentiation.

Philosophy has, following Aristotle, conceptualized difference as categorical difference, in which the other is discrete and distinct from the self, with the difference lying in the other (black to my white, male to my female, straight to my queer). Deleuze offers another approach to difference in which difference comes about through a continuous process of becoming different, of differentiation. Massey (2005: 21) describes these two approaches as:

1. "discrete difference/multiplicity (which refers to extended magnitudes and distinct entities, the realm of diversity)," and
2. "continuous difference/multiplicity (which refers to intensities, and to evolution rather than succession)."

In the first approach difference is being "divided up, a dimension of separation" while in the second, Deleuzian approach, difference is "a continuum, a multiplicity of fusion." Deleuze wishes "to instate the significance, indeed the philosophical primacy, of the second (continuous) form of difference over the first (the discrete) form. What is at issue is an insistence on the genuine openness of history, of the future" (Massey, 2005: 21). As Williams (2003: 60) points out, for Deleuze "real difference is a matter of how things become different, how they evolve

and continue to evolve beyond the boundaries of the sets they have been distributed into."

In what follows I will draw on a number of stories to flesh out this distinction between difference and differentiation, to bring it to life in pedagogical space. The first story here was written from my own memory while struggling with this new understanding of difference:

The small boy, in the week before first going to school, was playing joyfully with another child, who was going to go to the same school as he was to go to. His mother had invited her to play, having just met her parents who were new to the town—and to the country. The mother was happy watching them jumping up and down on the bed, and repeatedly falling down and laughing. It was the happiest she had seen him for a very long time. Then at school he did not play with her and he did not want her to visit any more.

Had he discovered, the mother wondered, that she was a girl and that boys did not play with girls? Or had he discovered she was black, and that white children did not play with black children?

The only explanation he could give his mother as to why he did not play with her was that she sniffed. This did not make sense to the mother, since he too was a child who sniffed, having not yet fully mastered the use of hankies.

If we approach the story in terms of the first conception of difference, it is a categorical difference that had been generated in the new setting of the school that inexorably separated the children from each other. The mother imagines it is the categories of gender or race that have divided them. The boy tells her it is the category of people who sniff. But he is in that same category so the mother cannot understand his explanation and their communication breaks down.

In contrast, if we approach the story through the Deleuzian conception of difference, in terms of intensities and evolution, then we see a joyful intensity in the first setting, with the boy becoming different in his intense engagement with the girl. *It was the happiest she had seen him for a very long time.* The space of the home makes possible this particular way of being and becoming, turning the bed into a trampoline, letting go, forgetting himself, and becoming someone new. But the space of the school works differently. What was possible at home is not possible here. The intensities and modes of becoming that are possible in this space do not make that same set of intensities possible. Before they went to school the child he played with was not separate; she was not the other;

rather, she opened up intensities in him that invited him to become different from himself. The two children flowed together, in Deleuzian terms, in a third stream that they created together (Deleuze, 1990: 136). Being a person in this way of thinking is not to belong to a category, but more in the nature of an event, or a series of events.

This reconceptualizing of difference has strong implications for pedagogy. Williams describes how Deleuze highlights the way in which the primacy of the first kind of difference:

...has become imbedded in thinking and common sense—for example, in the way learning involves exercises of attribution in the early stages of development and, indeed, much later, in the form of tests (Where does this thing belong? In which of these boxes would you put this thing? What is the difference between this set of things and that one?...Tick one box.). (Williams, 2003: 59-60)

In a Deleuzian pedagogy, in contrast, all subjects and objects are open to becoming different from themselves. My second story comes from a recent visit to a Reggio Emilia inspired preschool in Stockholm:

There were some chairs in the room we met in that had become dogs. I was particularly intrigued by a chair that had become a poodle. As I walked toward it, and gazed at it, it was clearly a chair. The children had stuck popcorn all over the chair, and the head of the dog had grown out of what had once been the back of the chair. It was when I realized I could no longer sit on the chair, that I understood it had lost its chairness and taken on enchanting intensities of tight white curls and a prancing saucy pointy faced poodleness. But more, I discovered, in a second transformation, a second event, the plastic bags of popcorn that made the ears had been opened by little fingers intent on transforming the handsome poodle into a feast of popcorn. The tight white popcorn curls of its body were safe as they tasted bad from the lacquer painted over them.

This fluidity of categories would have delighted Deleuze. The chair differentiates itself into intensities of poodleness and then into a feast, holding all the while some sense of chairness and poodleness and feast. Differentiation is the term used to capture this Deleuzian sense of difference.

Roffe describes the Deleuzian space of differentiation or becoming as first, "a moment of de-individualization, an escape to some degree from the limits of the individual. Secondly there must be the constitution of new ways of being in the world, new ways of thinking and feeling, new

ways of being a subject" (Roffe, 2007: 43). This conception of differentiation does not seek to fix subjects or objects in place, or tie them to static, individualistic, or binary identities, but opens up a space where creative energies are mobilized through ongoing relations within the spaces that are generated. Within the space of becoming, new ways of being and thinking are generated. This movement is not based on a rejection of the already-known, but on an assertion, rooted in philosophy, science and art, that life generates and is generated through movement and invention; it both draws on the already known, and it generates something new. The poodle did not reject the chair, but mobilized unexpected qualities in the chair to find the line of flight that made becoming-poodle possible.

A further major conceptual innovation in Deleuze's thinking concerns the nature of space and lines of force. How is it that one space opens up particular intensities and becomings and another does not? Deleuzian philosophy is intended to unsettle old ways of thinking about space, inviting us to engage in our lives as a series of encounters that open us up to the possibility of becoming members of "new kinds of society and new people" (Patton, 2007: ix). But that is not a categorical shift, moving from one kind of person to another. Not being fixed in their newness they cannot necessarily bring the new intensities with them (the joy of jumping together on the bed, for example), except in memory. Each event, each becoming, is necessarily new, while also building on the old. Life is emergent in Deleuzian philosophy, it continually evolves through the flows and intensities of each new encounter. One may remain within a habitual repeated series, or take off from the already-known in new lines of flight. Deleuze generates the concept of smooth space as the space in which such lines of flight take place, in which places locked into the striations of habituated repeated series, might be set loose—de-territorialized.

Territorial or "molar lines," in contrast to lines of flight, "organize by drawing strict boundaries, creating binary oppositions and dividing space into rigid segments with a hierarchical structure" (Woodward, 2007: 69). Molar lines create what Deleuze calls striated space.

Striated spaces are those which are rigidly structured and organized, and which produce particular, limited movements and relations between bodies...Smooth spaces, by contrast, are those in which movement is less

3). This conception of objects in place, or tie them together opens up a space where new relations within the field of becoming, new ways of movement is not based on a position, rooted in philosophy, mediated through movement known, and it generates the chair, but mobilized line of flight that made

Deleuze's thinking concerns that one space opens up where does not? Deleuzian thinking about space, encounters that open us up to kinds of society and new historical shift, moving from old in their newness they work with them (the joy of difference except in memory. Each is also building on the old. Continually evolves through One may remain within a ready-known in new lines of both space as the space in which places locked into the might be set loose—designs of flight, "organize by positions and dividing space" (Woodward, 2007: 69).
pace.

regulated and organized, and the relations between which movement is less

regulated or controlled, and where bodies can interact—and transform themselves—in endlessly different ways. (Hickey-Moody and Malins, 2007: 11).

What is so surprising about Deleuze, is that he brings together, again and again, the apparently irreconcilable, in provocative and productive ways. He asks us to think of these opposing lines, lines of flight and molar lines, and the smooth and striated spaces they create, not as alternatives, but as existing together in the same space. The molar lines of force create rigid striations, and at the same time offer places for experience and experimentation, in which new movements become possible, where old territories can be rethought, re-territorialized, where new connections can occur; where experimentation can open up a new line of flight. But even then, even in the moment of flight, it is necessary to have a "small plot of land," a place where the molar order keeps us safe (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 161).

The source of the third story that I will tell here, is multiple. It is about my own memory of playing at the sandbox in preschool, but it holds within it memories of watching my own children at play, as well as the children in my preschool studies (Davies 1989/2003; Davies and Kasama, 2004). It is a moment of becoming in a kindergarten classroom, where the molar striated order is open to the children's experimentation and difference.

Two children sit at the new sandbox. The sand is dry and white with fine grains, some of which sparkle and stick to their skin. They cup the dry sand in their hands and let it trickle through their fingers. They are waiting for instructions. The early morning light streams through the window and casts rectangular bars of shadow across the box. The sun warms the cold sand and their skin. The teacher places a big jug of water in each sandbox. The children look uncertain and glance around the classroom at what the others are doing. They scoop out a ditch and pour the water in. It escapes immediately. They try again and it escapes again. They scoop up the wet sand and squeeze it and plop handfuls of wet sand on top of each others' hands, racing each other to see who can do it fastest. They laugh. They work fast. They pat the castle that begins to emerge. It grows huge and solid and they pat it flat and hard, their hands flat and hard against the surface. First one, then the other, carefully scratches a small hole in the side, watching each other, responding to each other, digging deeper with small fingers, overcoming hesitation, seeing how deep the tunnel can go. The space

under their fingernails is filled with wet sand. Suddenly the castle fractures and one side sheers off in a straight line. They laugh with delight and one begins a road up the newly revealed face of the mountain. A window is hollowed out to reveal a house under the hill.

The children are, in Deleuze's terms, differentiating themselves as they experience and experiment with the intensities of the sand and the water and their partner in play. The intensities of the children's play emerge in the folds of the relationship with each other and with the sand, the water and the sun. They are immersed in the folds that the space affords them, unfolding into the sand and water and sunlight, and enfolded into it.

For Deleuze, following Leibniz, the relationship between bodies and spaces is one of folding. The world around us folds into our bodies; shaping not only our movements, postures, emotions and subjectivity, but also the very matter of which we are composed. We are folded by our genes, the food we consume and the air we breathe; by sound, texture, light and taste; by our relationship with others, and our interaction with the spaces around us. At the same time, bodies continually fold out into the world: shaping—and transforming—the spaces and places around them. (Malins, 2007: 157-8)

The play with the sand and the water is all absorbing, and joyful. The sand, like cloth, like their bodies, can be folded in many ways and brings forth unexpected intensities and new capacities. The pleasure is in the experience, the experimentation without a plan. It is not instrumental, or product-driven, but engaged, energized, and life-generating.

At the same time, their sense of safety is produced through the known and predictable striations of their classroom. Their time at the sand pit will be measured by the teacher. Their relations with each other are ordered by classroom rules of good behavior: they will sit at the sandbox as long as it is their turn; they will play co-operatively; they will give up the sandbox to others when they are told to do so; they will wash off the sand from their hands; only two will be at the box at any one time. In this sense the children simultaneously inhabit smooth and striated space, a space that is both open to the new, and a space that is tightly controlled. While striated spaces might limit the possibilities of change, they are also necessary for the production of familiar, safe places:

Stratifications are comforting: they enable the chaos of the world to be reduced to discrete categories of meaning and structure. They are also

impor
relatic
stratif
conne
poten

Striated
categoric
inhabit.
and res
naturaliz
they can
smooth
The bou
may cea
lines of f
limited |
becomin
and othe

In d
collectiv
students
haecceit
detrict
striation
time an
expectat
this stor
extensio
him. He
process
relation

*The
Mum,
respons*

*Wat
bag to c
the swi
level, su*

*Suddenly the castle
ine. They laugh with
revealed face of the
use under the hill.*

ciating themselves as
s of the sand and the
of the children's play
er and with the sand,
e folds that the space
er and sunlight, and

bodies and spaces is
ies; shaping not only
t also the very matter
the food we consume
e; by our relationship
us. At the same time,
id transforming—the

bing, and joyful. The
many ways and brings
he pleasure is in the
s not instrumental, or
erating.

ed through the known
time at the sand pit
with each other are
will sit at the sandbox
ely; they will give up
they will wash off the
any one time. In this
and striated space, a
t is tightly controlled.
change, they are also

of the world to be
ture. They are also

important, for they enable us to interact with the social world; to form relations with others and to have a political 'voice'. Yet it is essential that stratifications also be understood as limiting: they reduce the range of connections a body can make with the world around it; diminishing its potential for difference and becoming-other. (Malins, 2007: 153)

Striated space imposes binary thought, it cuts and divides objects into categories, and divides people from each other and from the spaces they inhabit. Such divisions can become dangerous in their power to control and restrict possibilities. In striated space the binaries become naturalized—the world is divided that way because it is that way—and they can create apparently insurmountable impediments to change. In smooth space those concepts may be invoked, but they may also dissolve. The boundary between self and sand, self and mountain, self and other may cease to have any useful meaning. Castles can become mountains, lines of fault can open new paths; the direction is not set. One is no longer limited by a preconceived idea of self, but immersed in a moment of becoming—folding, unfolding, being enfolded, enfolding earth, light, air, and other beings.

In discussing the fourth story that I will tell here, drawn from the collective biography workshop that Sue and I ran with teacher education students on the topic of pedagogy and place, I add the concept of haecceity. Haecceity or this-ness is integral to what Deleuze calls deterritorialized smooth space—the space that escapes over-coded striations. Smooth space enables an immersion in the present moment, in time and in space, that often eludes us in the press of normative expectations, of habitually repeated thoughts and practices. The boy in this story becomes immersed in an exploration of movement and co-extension, folding and unfolding himself into the smooth space around him. He is immersed in the haecceity of the moment, and so engaged in a process of becoming different, newly aware of himself and his body in relation to the space around him.

The red station wagon was parked in the front yard, boot open. Mum, unpacking the weekly shopping, presented me with the responsibility for a five kilo bag of brushed potatoes.

Watching the shopping bags accumulate beside the car, I swayed the bag to and fro. The sack seemed to have its own momentum, the arc of the swing becoming wider and wider, until the potatoes reached eye-level, suspended, before gravity thrust them in the reverse trajectory.

Through trial as much as bravado, I attempted a full 360 degrees. The potatoes swung the arm, the arm swung the potatoes. Each revolution faster, stronger. Inevitably, the centrifuge of an upward swing wrenched open the base of the bag.

Potatoes released into the air.

Silence.

And then brushed potatoes rained upon the ground. One landing on the blue-brick stairs, another beside the perennials. A potato rolling down the concrete path to the front gate. One under the lean of the letterbox. Finally, a thud on the station wagon roof. And two glaring eyes.

This story captures the precise haecceity or this-ness of the moment of co-extension with the weight of the bag of potatoes, and with the garden, the car, the falling potatoes, and his mother's eyes. In his exploration, his experimentation with the weight and velocity of the bag, the boy enters a vivid, smooth space.

A haecceity is a moment of pure speed and intensity (an individuation)—like when a swimming body becomes-wave and is momentarily suspended in nothing but an intensity of forces and rhythms. Or like when body becomes-horizon such that it feels only the interplay between curves and surfaces and knows nothing of here and there, observer and observed. (Halsey, 2007:146)

The moment of potatoes and boy almost in flight, almost together in that flight, and the car and the mother and the muscles and gravity of movement are the very this-ness of haecceity, where haecceity is not "simply...a décor or a backdrop that situates subjects," rather it is the "entire assemblage in its individuated aggregate that is a haecceity" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 262).

What also becomes evident in this story of the boy and the potatoes is that haecceity and smooth space can be dangerous. They are exploratory, not already territorialized with what is known, not contained within predictable striations. The mother's glaring eyes may herald disaster for the small boy. Lines of flight are not always or only productive of goodness, or desirable outcomes: they necessarily also hold the possibility of danger and fear.

In the fifth story, taken from my work on preschool children and gender, the danger and fear in response to the line of flight is stark. The child in the story, George, engages in a line of flight; he stops engaging in the habitual repetitions that mark him out as belonging in the category boy, thus moving outside his assigned gender category, outside the

gender
not-ma
known

Ge
shouti
comes
the ski

Th

They

childr

butter

and al

Georg

one as

with l

Georg

striati

make

habitu

beco

predic

W

establ

work

abject

boy v

boys-

his vi

make

divest

dropp

and f

accep

categ

T

dange

of be

mola

ull 360 degrees.
potatoes. Each
of an upward

One landing on
a potato rolling
the lean of the
no glaring eyes.
s of the moment
s, and with the
r's eyes. In his
ocity of the bag,

(duration)—like
suspended in
body becomes—
d surfaces and
ey, 2007:146)

together in that
and gravity of
haecceity is not
rather it is the
is a haecceity”

d the potatoes is
are exploratory,
ontained within
rald disaster for
y productive of
ld the possibility

ol children and
ght is stark. The
tops engaging in
; in the category
ory, outside the

gendered striations in which boy means not-feminine, and girl means not-masculine. George momentarily becomes not-recognizable within the known categories, and this signals danger to another boy:

George, in floating yellow skirt and cape, runs down the slope shouting “I am the power.” He comes over to talk to me. Another boy comes over to where he is standing, and punches him. George takes off the skirt, rolls it up, puts it under his arm, and punches the boy back.

The space of the preschool makes available the yellow skirt and cape. They are part of a kit that the teachers have used to engage all the children in imagining becoming caterpillars and turning into yellow butterflies. The concept of the cape, and flying, comes from super heroes, and also, for George, from a story I had read him called *Rita the Rescuer*. George doubles his power wearing two butterfly capes, one as a skirt and one as a cape and announces the power he feels as he runs down the slope with his skirt and cape flying. But another boy is provoked, seeing George's line of flight as wrong, as outside the molar lines of force, the striations that make up the gender order, that make his own masculinity make sense. The male-female binary works in such a way that the habituated, repeated practices through which each category is generated become not just the way the world is, but the way it should be. A predictable moral order is made possible through the categories.

With his punch, the boy who guards the molar/moral order re-establishes the binary gender order. He engages in category-maintenance work (letting George know he is getting his masculinity wrong), and abjection (expelling any desire to perform himself as feminine by hitting a boy who does so). He violently defends the division of the world into boys-who-are-not-feminine and girls-who-are-not-masculine. Through his violent confrontation he maintains the striated order that for him makes the world safe and predictable. Before he fights back, George divests himself of the feminine signifier, though not abjecting it, not dropping it on the ground (Davies, 2006). He holds onto it under his arm and fights with his trousers visible. His line of flight is dangerous, and he accepts the need to become the same as the other boy, to take up the category of boy through making his trousers visible and punching back.

The lines of flight in these stories are moments of both pleasure and danger. They are, in their very haecceity, intensely pleasurable moments of being and becoming, and they are always at risk of being blocked by molar striations that both self and others might impose. Those striations

make the world predictable and safe for the boy who punches George, and for George they may make his life precarious.

In this reading, George's story is one about the mechanisms through which categorical difference is maintained. It is also possible to read this story in terms of differentiation and becoming-artistic. Grosz points out that art is both about creating territories and deterritorialization. If the gender categories define the territory of the preschool, its striations, then George's flight down the slope is an act of deterritorialization, which involves:

...cutting through territories, breaking up systems of enclosure and performance, traversing territory in order to retouch chaos, enabling something mad, asystematic, something of the chaotic outside to reassert and restore itself in and through the body, through works and events that impact the body. (Grosz, 2008a: 18)

George's flight can be read as a breaking open of the known order, a creative event in which he generates another possible order. He engages in an artistic becoming—in which his body and his voice interact with the yellow butterfly capes and the slope of the hill, to create a different territory, one not divided up by a binary gender order. His act can appear mad (and bad) because it lies outside the already known. It connects with chaos (the combination of multiple possible orders) to create new intensities. Like the small boy jumping on the bed, he becomes in that moment a different being, experimenting with intensities usually precluded from those marked as belonging in the category "boy."

The final story here, also from my preschool studies, is of Joanne and her friend Tony taking over the new tree house. The tree house can be thought of in architectural terms as a frame:

The frame separates. It cuts into a milieu or space. This cutting links it to the plane of composition, to the provisional ordering of chaos through the laying down of a grid or order that entraps chaotic shards, chaoid states, to arrest or slow them into a space and a time, a structure and a form where they can affect and be affected by bodies. (Grosz, 2008a: 13)

On this first day of the tree house's appearance up in the big leafy tree, the group of dominant boys immediately claimed it as belonging in the series of spaces that they were able to control—it belonged with the wooden fort and the top of the climbing frame, for example, which were

recogni
telling t
order to
treehou
they we
disgust

Joa
domina
the fort
they ab
princes
this pai
away fr

The
and To
making
those u
onto th
since T
comple
express
teacher
stoppec
cleanin

The
a new
Their f
declara
for the
takeov
undon
for this
catego

a prot
space t
Th
catego
punchi
throug

ches George, and
 mechanisms through
 ssible to read this
 Grosz points out
 rialization. If the
 ts striations, then
 rialization, which

enclosure and
 chaos, enabling
 side to reassert
 and events that

e known order, a
 order. He engages
 e interact with the
 create a different
 his act can appear
 l. It connects with
) to create new
 becomes in that
 intensities usually
 ry "boy."

, is of Joanne and
 tree house can be

ng links it to the
 rough the laying
 ates, to arrest or
 where they can

the big leafy tree,
 s belonging in the
 elonged with the
 mple, which were

recognized by everyone as their spaces. But the teachers intervened, telling the boys it was not in that series—it was not a boys' only space. In order to convince them of the break in this series they climbed into the treehouse and pointed out to the protesting boys ensconced there, that they were now there and they were girls. The boys climbed down in disgust and returned to their older undisputed territories.

Joanne had often talked to me about her desire to be a member of the dominant boys' group. But she didn't dare to join them when they were in the fort, as they might push her down. And when they did let her play, they almost always positioned her in a position she did not like, of a princess who had to be saved. Only once had they let her be a hero. On this particular morning she adopted her usual strategy of enticing Tony away from the other boys to play with her.

The teachers had declared the tree house open to anyone. Joanne and Tony climbed up the ladder and quickly developed a strategy for making it their own. They dropped tiny bits of sawdust into the eyes of those who were climbing the ladder, who would then fall down crying onto the grass. The teachers were mystified as to what the problem was, since Tony and Joanne, looking down over the tree house railing, looked completely innocent. Then Tony saw me watching, and shrugged, the expression on his face dismissing me as irrelevant. Presumably I was not a teacher and had no power. But when Joanne saw me watching she stopped, seeing herself through my gaze. She called out to me: "We are just cleaning all this sawdust off the floor that the carpenters have left here."

The takeover of the tree house is both pleasurable and dangerous. It is a new framing of space, in which the as-yet-unknown might take place. Their first experiment is to find a way to make it their own, against the declaration that it is for anyone. The teachers' declaration has cleared it for them to use, but also for everyone else. Their pleasure in the strategic takeover is intense. But it is also dangerous as they may well come undone and be positioned as naughty children. But Joanne is prepared for this undoing and forestalls it with a rapid move back into her good girl category. The category thus works, even in the chaos of the new space, as a protective device. It creates a safe striated space inside the smooth space that had opened up.

Through the habitual repeated, molar striations through which the categories boy and girl are made real we might say that the self of the punching boys in George's story both deciphers and reiterates itself through categories that are secured in the act of their take-up. The self of

Joanne as girl deciphers and reiterates itself in the virtuous act of cleaning the floor. This does not mean she loses the earlier intensities any more than George loses the moment of power in the flight down the slope. Deleuze emphasizes the importance of AND between each of our repetitions and becomings. We are this AND that, always becoming something more, something else. The self is performed through habitual repetitions that may foreclose the new, making the new virtually impossible. Lines of flight, one's own and those of others, can be terrifying and they can be very exciting—and they can be a provocation that generates new intensities and new becomings. I want to suggest here that it is precisely in engaging with the incomprehensible, in going beyond the already-known, and working with it rather than against it, that relationality and community, and becoming-artistic in relation to others, both human and not, can flourish.

The different location of the individual in relation to space and relationality that we explore in this book, has strong ethical implications for one's relations with others and one's relations with place. Ethics no longer rests so much on individualized decision-making subjects, but on the ongoing openness of each to the other, and the recognition each bestows on the other, moment-by-moment. In Braidotti's words, this generates a sustainable ethics through an "enlarged sense of community" responsive to both human and non-human others:

A sustainable ethics for a non-unitary subject proposes an enlarged sense of interconnection between self and others, including the non-human or 'earth' others, but removing the obstacle of self-centered individualism. This is not the same as absolute loss of values, it rather implies a new way of combining self-interests with the well-being of an enlarged sense of community, which includes one's territorial or environmental interconnections. (Braidotti, 2006: 35)

In Rinaldi's words: "When you consider others as part of your own identity, then their different, sometimes divergent, theories and opinions are seen as a resource. The awareness of the value of these differences and of having dialogue among them increases" (2006: 206).

The individualized and unitary subject, once a significant and desired end-product of educational practices, gives way in this new way of thinking about pedagogy and place, to what Guattari et al. (1995) called an interdependent "ethico-aesthetic' paradigm," which brings relational

"pragmat
expressio

Throu
those wh
combinat
aestheti
envisages
expansion
practices

Cepp
normalit
exception
pre-defir
contradic
relationa
individu
technolo
producti
technolo
served b
rules int
aesthetic
each otl
differenc

Dele
ethical l
"soverei
less sign

...cap
affirm
futur
open

This op
are exp
(includi
and dic
in a ne

the virtuous act of earlier intensities any the flight down the between each of our ; always becoming ed through habitual the new virtually of others, can be in be a provocation want to suggest here ehensible, in going than against it, that 1 relation to others, tion to space and ethical implications ith place. Ethics no ing subjects, but on e recognition each idotti's words, this ense of community"

enlarged sense of non-human or 'earth' alism. This is not way of combining community, which ctions. (Braidotti,

part of your own theories and opinions of these differences 206).

significant and desired of this new way of et al. (1995) called h brings relational

"pragmatics and micro-politics" together with "attempts to free expression to create new combinations" (Roy, 2004: 309).

Throughout this book we explore pedagogical relations, including those where art making, writing and theatre are used to create new combinations and possibilities for becoming in contexts where ethics and aesthetics are closely intertwined. The sustainable ethics that Braidotti envisages is generated in these spaces, in part, through the enlargement, expansion and expression made possible in aesthetic and creative practices, and in part through a different kind of attention to relationality.

Ceppi and Zini adopt the term "rich normality" or "dynamic normality" to describe "an environment and a society that are made up of exceptions and special cases... This does not mean adherence to formal or pre-defined parameters, but the conscious and capable management of contradictions and conflicts" (1998: n.p.). This is a very different relationality to that imposed by neoliberalism, where highly individualized subjects compete for limited resources while the technologies of government work on them as a population to become productive (Foucault, 2003). As a population subjected to those technologies, individuals become generic subjects whose best interest is served by being competitive at the expense of others, and by following rules intended to protect those who govern them from risk. In the ethico-aesthetic paradigm, in contrast, individuals have good reason to listen to each other, to care for each other, and to be enlarged by others' difference.

Deleuze and Guattari invite us to generate an amplitude of life, an ethical life, a life not limited by the already known. The concept of the "sovereign individual," alone in his or her power to affect the world, is less significant than the practices that maximize the:

...capacities of all bodies to affect and be affected. [Ethics] is also about affirming difference and the production of the new. Rather than limiting the future to what has already been or to what is already known, ethics involves opening up the potential for the unknown. (Hickey-Moody and Malins, 2007: 4)

This openness to the unknown is integral to the spaces of learning that are explored in this book, where relationality and sensitivity to the other (including non-human others) can sometimes transcend the constraints and dictates of curriculum. Ethico-aesthetic connections do not take place in a neutral space. Bodies enfold space and they fold out into space, and

are in this sense co-extensive with the places and spaces they inhabit. In Merleau Ponty's terms: "the bodies of others are not objects; they are phenomena that are coextensive with one's own body" (1964:118). Or Weiss: "the experience of being embodied is never a private affair, but is always already mediated by our continual interactions with other human and non-human bodies" (1999: 5). Massey analyses spaces and places as always made up of multiple stories-so-far, that is, stories told from within differing trajectories with radically different histories. Every story, she suggests, is a story unfolding, a story that will encounter other stories that require something new, not in order to deny or negate the other's (sometimes incommensurable) story, but in order to extend the capacity of oneself, and one's community of others, for becoming.

And so...

Each of the chapters that follows engages in a line of flight from a particular assemblage of authors, concepts, becomings and writings, that enables us to explore how pedagogy and place might be thought productively in terms of opening up spaces of becoming, of encounter, of relationality--spaces that are productive of life. In the next chapter Constance turns to the fieldnotes from her ethnographic study of homeless youth, from which she was inspired to draw during the collective biography workshop at Bombo. Her stories take pedagogical encounters beyond the traditional school walls working with young people who are outside the molar order of everyday schooling.

LISTE A STR CONSTAN

*This mo:
Jason an
He does:
restless.
him, Ry
Matt int
together
indicati*

*Both
with Jas
the hood
Jason u
example
underst
and she
herself r
also talk
to be in
fuck anc*

*I sit
with the
I need d
smell ar
am an i
it was s
up. "I'm
desk an
bag con
bars. H
quick sp
chocola.*